"White Supremacy," Self-Determination, and Human Rights

Posted on 2015-05-26

White-supremacist.

Neo-nazi.

Racist.

Sometimes words are used by their textbook definition, other times they are used to misrepresent something, and sometimes they are used to signal. When one person says to another that something is one of these words, the other person probably won't investigate it; he *knows* he shouldn't touch it. It's poisoned. It's toxic. It's bad. It's evil. He might even get concerned enough to spread the word and let other people know how bad something he just heard about is. Associating with witches will make you guilty of being one, so why not save other people the misfortune?

What is white supremacy? It means exactly what it sounds like, a belief that whites are innately *better* than other people. Societies which have most famously been white supremacist are the Confederate States of America and segregation/apartheid era South Africa. Speaking of *apartheid,* what a scary and German-sounding word. I guess we can't call it segregation because that would create some sort of moral equivalency between South Africa and the United States. But I digress.

Neo-nazi, is another common epithet for shutting down or tuning out or signaling the evilness of someone or something. Nazis were bad so neo-nazis are people who want to be bad but they're new, which is even worse!! Didn't we defeat all the Nazis? My grandfather fought in such and such regiment against the Germans at Normandy… You get the idea. Whatever we're talking about here, it's *bad*. For the record, there are in fact, actual neo-nazis. They get tattoos and flags and everything. It's essentially a fetishism for Nazi Germany and usually has very little ideological underpinnings or rational context. But if you ask the ADL or the SPLC, there are plenty of neo-nazi groups in America. Most of them aren't actually National Socialist LARPers but who cares about being accurate when you're slinging mud.

Then there's racist. This is perhaps one of the most overused words in the American English lexicon. People are always on the lookout for new things to call racist. Americans aren't even clear what this word means anymore in a universal context. There's an ongoing debate over whether or not people who aren't white can be racist, since so many on the left and in media define racism as white-on-black. And then it of course circles back to white supremacy=neo-nazism=racism.

Essentially all three of these terms are used against anyone who advocates for collective white interests, or treats whites as a group separate from other groups. It should be painstakingly noted that every other ethnic or ethno-religious group does this in the United States: blacks/African Americans, Hispanic/Latino Americans, Asian Americans, American Indians, Jews, Muslims, etc. They are all recognized as groups with distinct economic, cultural, political, whatever interests. Whites are held to a double standard. They can't have collective interests. That's racist.

Suppose you thought that white countries had a right to maintain their white majorities, and therefore should restrict immigration from non-white countries. That would get you labeled a racist and a white supremacist in most of the Western world except for maybe Hungary or Italy, while in countries like Israel, Japan, China, India, South Korea, and many African countries, you would be considered patriotic and normal. No one would attempt to slander or

pathologize you for advocating for your own people and their continued existence and demographic control of their homeland, which in many cases won its independence from a foreign power via war. Despite its catastrophically low birthrate and the small but increasingly loud calls for immigration to solve its demographic problems, Japan has not opened its ports. It is still well over 90% Japanese. The same can be said for South Korea and its Korean population. They want to keep their countries for people like themselves, and they are not pathologized for doing so. At worst, they're xenophobic, but rarely *racist*. That's a term for European-derived peoples only.

Now suppose you live in the United States and don't think the white majority matters very much but think that white people should acclimate to being an ethnic group in a multi-ethnic society. Stopping immigration is a lost cause for a number of reasons, you rationalize, and there's nothing you can do about the diversity that's already here. You accept that multiculturalism works and that different groups can share a country and a government in harmony. You would believe that whites need to build their own civil society and cultural institutions analogous to those that other groups have, because the federal government and society at large no longer represents you alone in a post-white America. Unfortunately for you, this would also be condemned as white supremacist, neo-nazi, or racist. When whites become a plurality and then a minority, it will *still* be seen as racist to advocate for white institutions or a white civil society within the United States. The left-wing narrative of "white privilege" and white guilt and double standards for white social and political behavior will only intensify as leftist voting blocs become numerically larger. This is natural given that the United States is a democratic country, has pretty much moved more left every generation, and has an increasing non-white population, the majority of whom vote for the center-left party, the Democrats.

So whether you're some sort of white nationalist who wants America to have a white majority, or someone who wants to ride the changing demographics of the United States and ask to be respected as any other group, you're going to lose. Let's not even get started on the idea of whites creating a separate country for themselves like the Jews did in Palestine or the Muslims and Hindus did in the British Raj. That would be *even more racist* since you'd be excluding people based on race. Actually that's literally racist. We've reached equilibrium here.

I am not asking you to agree with me about white people or their place in the United States—depending on how you found my blog you might anyway—but simply to consider what your own biases against whites acting collectively might be.

Chapter 1, Article 1-2 of the Charter of the United Nations states that one of its purposes is:

To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for ***the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples****, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;*

[my emphasis]

So the UN charter, by the way, is racist, because it thinks that all peoples, typically interpreted as nations, have the right to self-determination and also equal rights. Self-determination means creating your own country, usually based on the overlapping of ethnicity and geography. That means drawing a border to *exclude people from your new state,* by the way. Examples of countries created this way include most of post-colonial Africa and Asia and many of the smaller European nations that were part of contiguous land empires and most of the Arab nations that were under Ottoman Turkish rule. If it's racist for whites to assert their group interests in such a way, I would argue it is racist for everyone else by the principles of equality to do the same.

It should be self-evident to anyone that the United States is not a nation because it is multiethnic and approaching minority-majority in terms of demographics. What that means then is that the different ethnic or racial groups within the country are, in effect, nations without states. I believe the United States is a *union* of these nations, and if the UN charter is to be believed, could dissolve that at any time by the principle of self-determination and that these nations are also entitled to equal rights. One of those rights is self-determination. See where this is going yet?

Something that goes lockstep with pathologizing expressions of white group interests is, of course, that whites don't frequently assert those in the first place. White culture in the United States is highly individualistic, to the point where many whites, especially liberals, will champion the interests of the out-group over their own. It's a peculiar situation where other peoples are recognized as having group interests while one's own group isn't, a kind of cognitive dissonance. Thus, whites are often essentially *anti*-white supremacists and anti-racists. They want to save poor people in Africa and Asia and Latin America, or tweet that #BlackLivesMatter, but they don't very much care to advocate for themselves.

And so long as you advocate the same things for yourself that you'd want for anyone else, I don't think you are a supremacist, or a nazi, or a racist. If you think that whites are entitled to group interests like anyone else, that shouldn't be condemned. If you think they should have a homeland, that puts you equal footing with most of the non-Western world. It's time to end the double standard against white people for simply existing.

This entry was posted in America, Ideology and tagged human rights, narrative, nationalism, neo-nazi, racism, self-determination, UN, united nations, white, white nationalism, white supremacy. Bookmark the permalink.

70 Responses to *"White Supremacy," Self-Determination, and Human Rights*

Pingback: *Lawrence Murray, "Gibs + Anarcho Tyranny: The #BlackLivesMatter Platform" | Counter-Currents Publishing*

Pingback: *Could White Advocacy Exist in a Multi-Ethnic Society? | ATLANTIC CENTURION*

Pingback: *Lawrence Murray, "What is the Alt Right?" | Counter-Currents Publishing*

Pingback: *Alt-RINOs, Those Who Incur the Wrath of Kek | ATLANTIC CENTURION*

Pingback: *Esoteric Kekism is a Religion of Peace | ATLANTIC CENTURION*

Pingback: *Milo's Alt-Right | ATLANTIC CENTURION*

Pingback: *The Right Style Guide | ATLANTIC CENTURION*

Pingback: *Paul Fromm: Whites Under Attack in America and South Africa – aladdinsmiraclelamp*

Pingback: *What Will Become of the Empire? Visions of Late Modernity in United States | ATLANTIC CENTURION*

Pingback: *The Conservative Case for Trump: A Final Appeal | ATLANTIC CENTURION*

Pingback: *The Conservative Case for Trump: A Final Appeal - Political Bias*

Pingback: *Now I am become President, Leader of the Free World | ATLANTIC CENTURION*

Pingback: *Election Reaction Makes the Case for Partition | ATLANTIC CENTURION*

Pingback: *Zero to Eighty-Eight: Notes on Building a Deep State | ATLANTIC CENTURION*

Pingback: *Zero to Eighty-Eight: Notes on Building a Deep State | The Redcoats*

Create a free website or blog at WordPress.com.